

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

#### **Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 2 and 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sawatsubashi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,148,301) in view of *Wakai et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,166,085).

#### **Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 5 and 6 by this amendment. Claims 22-23 have been newly added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, and 5-23 are currently pending, with claims 1, 2, 5-8, 22, and 23 being under consideration.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 2 and 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sawatsubashi et al.* in view of *Wakai et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

According to an embodiment of the present invention as claimed, in addition to a pixel electrode formed on a second substrate, an electrode pattern is formed on the second substrate between a seal pattern and a protective film. See, for example, electrode pattern element 5 in FIG. 5 of the present invention. In contrast to the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Sawatsubashi et al.* nor *Wakai et al.* teaches or suggests the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 1 including at least “wherein the electrode pattern is between said seal pattern and said protective film.”

The Office Action acknowledges at paragraph 2, line 10 that *Sawatsubashi et al.* does not

disclose a pixel electrode formed on the protective film. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that *Sawatsubashi et al.* also fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 1 including at least “wherein the electrode pattern is between said seal pattern and said protective film.” The Office Action appears to assert that the seal member (108) as taught by *Sawatsubashi et al.* corresponds to the seal pattern as set forth in claim 1. However, *Sawatsubashi et al.*’s seal member (108) does not contact an electrode pattern. In fact, no portion of *Sawatsubashi et al.*’s disclosure appears to discuss forming an electrode pattern on the second substrate (101) between the seal member (108) and a protective film or forming a protective film on the second substrate (101). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that *Sawatsubashi et al.* fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 1 including at least “wherein the electrode pattern is between said seal pattern and said protective film.”

Similarly, it is respectfully submitted that *Wakai et al.* also fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 1 including at least “wherein the electrode pattern is between said seal pattern and said protective film.” In fact, no portion of *Wakai et al.*’s disclosure appears to discuss forming an electrode pattern on the second substrate (101) between a seal pattern and a protective film. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that *Wakai et al.* fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 1 including at least “wherein the electrode pattern is between said seal pattern and said protective film.”

Since *Sawatsubashi et al.* and *Wakai et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every feature of independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of *Sawatsubashi et al.* and *Wakai et al.* does not render claim 1 unpatentable. Further, since claims 2 and 5-8 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the

combination of *Sawatsubashi et al.* and *Wakai et al.* also does not render claims 2 and 5-8 unpatentable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

**New Claims 22-23**

Applicants have added new claims 22-23 to differently define the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 22-23 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 1.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Victoria D. Hao

Registration No. 47,630

Dated: June 13, 2003

**Customer No.: 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.739.3000

Facsimile: 202.739.3001